

president of two pharmaceutical associations—in his defense of the consumer's right to know.

Lew and I became friends during the negotiations that led to enactment of the Drug Price Competition and Patent Term Restoration Act of 1984, a bill I was proud to author with Representative HENRY WAXMAN.

The 1984 law addressed two seemingly competing needs: The need for brand name pharmaceutical companies to regain the patent life they had lost awaiting FDA approval of their products; and the interests of the fledgling generic drug industry in speeding their products to market as soon as the innovator patent had expired.

We faced this challenge—how to balance the research-based drug industry's desire for patent lives adequate to encourage research against the generic industry's desire to put competing copies on the market as soon as possible—we faced this challenge head-on.

It was a complicated issue, and indeed a challenge. The public wants newer and better drugs, and that necessitates adequate research, which, quite simply, is costly. At the same time, consumers also want less expensive drugs.

Lew represented the research firms. It was not easy—they had varying interests. But his political acumen, and his personal belief in competition, got the job done.

In short, Lew had a fine line to walk, and he walked it with honor and courage.

In the end, Lew's refusal to break his promise to support a compromise, a compromise that had been worked out between the House, Senate, and industry, cost Lew his job. He left it head high, integrity intact.

It would take pages to list all Lew's achievements, from selection by Time magazine in 1974 as one of the country's young men to watch, through a career as a top Washington official. But Lew's was not a life to measure in jobs and titles, but rather by the thread that ran through it all.

It is a comfortable thing for a man to know who he is and what he believes. No one who knew Lew could believe he did anything but comfortable.

I will miss Lew Engman. My heart goes out to his wife, Pat, to whom he was devoted, and to his three boys.

They have lost a loving husband and father.

We all have lost a man of principle and a fine American.

I know that Lew will be missed by all of us.

IN RECOGNITION OF THOSE WHO SERVE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in Chapter 9 of the Book of Ecclesiastes, we find the following portrait in verses 14 and 15: "There was a little city, and few men within it; and there came a great King against it, and besieged it, and built great bulwarks against it. Now

there was found in it a poor wise man, and he by his wisdom delivered the city; yet, no man remembered that same poor man."

This is a lesson that is often repeated, and, in fact, it is constantly being played and replayed all about us, if we but pause to observe it.

As a former welder in the shipyards on the east and gulf coasts, and as a Senator who has witnessed the christening of great oceangoing vessels, I have attended the splendorous pageantry that accompanies the launching of a ship, as have many of my colleagues. The scene is one in which great crowds gather, bands fill the air with their martial music, the trumpets blare, the banners fly, dignitaries are assembled, orators declaim, the champagne sparkles and flows, and shouts and cheers ring out as the ship slowly glides into the channel. The program ends, "the tumult and the shouting dies, the Captains and the Kings depart", and in the pause that lingers in the human contemplation, one may perhaps reflect upon the hours of toil that were spent by the welders, the riveters, the pipefitters, the mechanics, the ironworkers, and the scores of other crafts that went into the building of the ship. The men who operated huge cranes, the carpenters who drove the nails, the workers who pulled the cables and lifted huge burdens and swept the decks—the sweat and labor of thousands of men and women, working with their hands and minds through long days and nights—all these made it possible. Yet, in the glittering pageantry of the launch, who remembered these unsung workers whose work made the dream become a reality?

As a politician, I have attended many banquets, many church suppers, many enjoyable evening repasts, as I am sure all of my colleagues have done. Often, I have reflected upon the words of Ecclesiastes on my way home after such a delightful event. Long after the program has ended, and the echoes of the speaker's voice have faded away, and the handshakes and the goodbyes have been overtaken by the darkness that falls from the sable-vested wings of night, there are those who are still working in the grimy kitchen, cleaning the silverware and the dishes and the pots and the pans, and putting away the linens, mopping the floors and disposing of the garbage so that the kitchen and the meeting hall will be polished and clean and ready for the next church supper. It was an enjoyable feast, the laughter and the pleasant conversations will long be recalled, but who will remember the calloused hands of toil that prepared the delectable dishes, that cooked the food, that washed and dried the dinnerware? Who will remember those men and women who gave up the pleasant hours of rest following the epicurean delights? Who will remember those who stayed and turned out the lights and locked the doors and saw to it that everything was

in order before returning to the humble cottage and a bed of hard-earned rest from the difficult chores?

Mr. President, these are the kinds of people who go about daily and do the hard work that makes the world go around. They are unobtrusive, they are unassuming, they quietly do their duty and earn, in the sweat of their brow, their daily bread. The farmer at the plow, the fisherman on the stormy deep, the miner toiling in the bowels of the Earth, the sweating ironworker at the blast furnace, the herdsman on the hills and plains, the lowly private at his station, the helmsman of the ship on the rolling waves, the policeman on his lonely beat, the mother who spends a sleepless night by the side of her fevered child, the housewife who mends and sews and keeps the home fires burning—these are the unsung heroes who make the world go around. They are not often remembered, but too often forgotten.

Many times, Mr. President, in my 43 years of working in this Capitol building, after a long day at the office, upon leaving the Capitol,

I heard the trailing garments of the Night,
sweep through her marble halls,

I saw her sable skirts all fringed with light,
from the celestial walls.

Yet, in our meditations seldom, perhaps, do we reflect upon those who sweat and toil to make these walls and halls beautiful—the charwomen, the janitors, the people who mop and wax and polish the floors of Minton tile. I have seen them in the wee hours of the morning polishing the brass rails that go up and down the marbled stairs. I have seen them dusting the artistic works of the great Brumidi. I have seen them carting the desks, moving the chairs, and carrying the dishes of food as dinners and luncheons are served. They make and keep these elegant surroundings clean and attractive for the tourists and for those of us who work here. Yet, how often do we remember them? How often do we pause to thank them, to give them a pat on the back, and to express words of appreciation for the services they perform? The contributions of these dedicated workers allow the essential work of this body and much of America to proceed. We are in their debt. I take these few moments to salute them here today.

Likewise, we seldom talk to acknowledge and appreciate the essential labor of the excellent staffers who serve us here in the Senate. During the course of my, as I say, nearly 43 years in this building, I have come to appreciate and respect the contributions and dedication that our staff bring to this institution. Behind much of the work that is conducted in committee hearings and on this floor there are many staff people who have toiled for hours and days and weeks to make it all possible. While we, as the elected officials, carry the ultimate responsibility for the legislation and policy that are set by the Senate, the input from our staffs is considerable and valuable.

I have been disturbed by the recent articles in the press which have focused on the reputation of certain Senate staff and of one staff person in particular. It appears that there are those individuals in the political arena who have determined that, in order to promote their particular agendas, it is necessary to excoriate and vilify any person who represents a different point of view. The criticisms leveled have been vicious and unrelenting. There is a take-no-prisoner, scorched-earth attitude, with little concern for the individuals who are wounded as part of this guerrilla-style rhetoric.

Mr. President, Sheila Burke has worked for the Senate since 1977. Since joining the staff of Senator DOLE, Sheila has proved to be a superb employee. She has represented the interests of Senator DOLE and those of the Republican Conference in a way that they all can be proud. I have always found Sheila to be fair and even-handed. When I was the leader of my party in the Senate, I had the occasion from time to time to talk with Sheila Burke. I never came to know her well, but I did come to admire her greatly. Her abilities have benefited both sides of the aisle.

The Senate can only operate in an atmosphere of compromise and conciliation. There is no place for the slings and arrows of fortune that have been directed at Mrs. Burke. Frankly, many of her critics seem to be more concerned with the operations of the White House in 1997 than of the Senate of 1995. My feeling is that we ought to be more concerned with the difficult issues that face us here and now. The massive problems facing this nation demand all of our attention. We ought to be working together to address these concerns instead of worrying about who may occupy the position of White House Chief of Staff in some future administration.

Sheila Burke is a most capable individual. She has a family. She is a mother. She has three children. She has a husband who commutes back and forth to Connecticut. Yet, she finds time to be a good mother, a good wife, and to be a good chief of staff of a Senator—in this case, the majority leader. She is a registered nurse. She is a very disciplined, professional woman. That is my perception of Sheila Burke.

She has to be tough. She has to be tough. She represents her boss and she does it well. I have a chief of staff. I have loyal members on my staff, many of whom have been with me for years. I know that a chief of staff has to be dedicated, has to be very capable, and has to represent the viewpoints of the Senator who employs her.

It must be very difficult to do the job and do it well, and especially if one is criticized in the public press for doing that job and doing it well.

I consider Sheila a loyal and trusted employee of the Senate. I think it is time for the cowards who would hide behind the uncalled for criticism of a Senate staffer to direct their venom-

enhanced energy toward becoming constructive players of the legislative process. As a staff person, she cannot very well defend herself in the press. It must be pretty hard for her, with the stresses that are upon her as a chief of staff, to bear up under such unfair and unwarranted criticism.

I admire her courage.

Plutarch tells us, of Aristides, who was one of the 10 Athenian generals at the Battle of Marathon in 490 B.C. Aristides was also at the Battle of Salamis in 480, B.C.

And as one of the archons, Aristides conducted himself in such a way and with such a high sense of justice and with such great virtue that he was given the surname, Plutarch tells us, "the Just." "Aristides the Just." Themistocles sought to undermine Aristides' standing with the people, and spread the word that Aristides was assuming to himself the work of the adjudicator and making the decisions himself, and so stirred up the people.

Plutarch tells us that the Ostracism was a process by which those individuals who excited envy in the minds of others might be banished. It was not a punishment for a crime or misdemeanor but just a way of lessening and humiliating, making more humble those who were achievers.

The process worked something like this, according to Plutarch. The citizens throughout Attica came to Athens and they took earthen shells, or pieces of pots and other earthenware, and wrote the name of an individual on those shells—an individual they wished to see banished. They took the shells to the marketplace where there was an enclosure behind a wooden rail, and the magistrates, then, would count the shells. And if there were less than 6,000 shells with names, the Ostracism failed. But if there were 6,000 or more of these shells, then the individual whose name appeared on most of the 6,000 shells would be banished.

So, upon this occasion as Aristides was walking about the marketplace, witnessing the goings on, a certain illiterate rustic approached him, Aristides, and asked Aristides to write on the shell the name "Aristides." Aristides was somewhat surprised and curious, and he asked the individual if Aristides had ever done him, the individual, a wrong?

The rustic replied, "No, nor do I even know him; but it vexes me to everywhere hear him called the Just."

I wonder sometimes if this is not what we see all too often, by those who envy the achievers.

The scriptures say, "Wrath is cruel, and anger is outrageous; but who is able to stand before envy?"

Mr. President, it is the same story with anyone who accomplishes things and in some way establishes a good name for himself. There will always be those who will criticize the achievers among us. The world will always be divided into two classes: those who go ahead and do things, and those who sit

on the sidelines and say, "Why was it not done the other way?"

Alexander the Great bore the censures of his critics with great moderation and used to say, "There was something noble in hearing himself ill spoken of while he was doing well."

And Voltaire says somewhere that it is a noble thing to make ingrates.

I think it best to heed Polonius' advice to Laertes, as given to us in Hamlet,

Take each man's censure, but reserve thy judgment

... this, above all: to thine ownself be true, and it must follow, as the night the day, thou canst not be false to any man.

So, if I may close with a few words of comfort and encouragement to Sheila, they would be these: You have shown that you "can keep your head when all about you are losing theirs and blaming it on you." Continue on this path of duty.

I say to Senators, I think we err if we do not encourage those who achieve. So I want to add my words of encouragement to Sheila Burke.

Continue on the path of duty. Do not be turned aside by the skeptics, the doubters, the cynics. Satisfaction will come in the serenity of a clear conscience and the knowledge that:

Tired of the Senate's barren brawl,
An hour with silence we prefer,
Where statelier rise the woods than all
Yon towers of talk at Westminster.
Let this man prate and that man plot,
On fame or place or title bent:
The votes of veering crowds are not
The things that are more excellent.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE DEFENSE MODERNIZATION ACCOUNT

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, on Saturday, August 5, 1995, I offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute to section 1003 of S. 1026, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996. My amendment, cosponsored by Senator ROTH and Senator GRASSLEY, was accepted by unanimous consent of the Senate. At this time I would like to make some comments about my amendment. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the amendment be printed in the RECORD following my remarks, along with some relevant correspondence on this issue between Senator LEVIN and Office of Management and Budget Director Rivlin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GLENN. I would like to say at the outset that I share Senator NUNN's concerns that the military departments—indeed, I would say, all agencies of Government—should have incentives to find savings within the programs under their jurisdiction. I would further agree with the distinguished ranking member of the Armed Services Committee that one of the flaws of our current budget and appropriations process is that, rather than encouraging cost-savings efficiencies, it induces